DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 786 SP 028 933

AUTHOR McInerney, William, D.
TITLE Establishing University-School District Collaboration in the Education of Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Development; *College School Cooperation; Critical Thinking; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *School Districts; *Schools of Education; Skill Development; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A collaborative relationship established between the Department of Education at Purdue University in Indiana and the Twin Lakes School Corporation of Monticello, Indiana, sought to design preservice experiences enabling prospective teachers to develop and enhance critical thinking skills in their pupils. The development of this collaborative relationship necessitated training for school district staff and college faculty and the creation of a curriculum and experience program for the prospective teachers. As the relationship developed, a greater need was seen for improved coordination and communication between university and school district personnel. It was found that the cultures and environments of the two organizations were different. Classroom teachers involved in the program were particularly concerned about the sincerity of the university faculty and the possible loss of power. Teachers expressed positive attitudes, however, regarding released time for planning, involvement on committees, and professional treatment. Plans continue for further improvement of the collaborative relationship. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283786

Establishing University-School District Collaboration in the Education of Teachers

William D. McInerney

Assistant Professor

Educational Administration

Purdue University

American Educational Research Association

Washington, D. C.

April, 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. D. McInerney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 933

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Establishing University-School District Collaboration in the Education of Teachers

One of the most promising features on the educational horizon is the establishment of collaborative relationships between the colleges which train teachers and the school districts which employ them. Efforts to institutionalize these relationships afford an opportunity to explore issues which bear on teacher preparation and the professionalization of teaching. This paper reports on one such effort, between the Department of Education at Purdue University, and the Twin Lakes School Corporation of Monticello, Indiana. At issue is the design of pre-service experiences that will enable young teachers to enter the profession capable of teaching in ways that enhance the development of critical thinking skills in their students. Corollary to this are such questions as the appropriate role of each institution in this process, the possibilities for problem exploration and knowledge generation inherent in such a relationship, and the problems and pitfalls endemic to collaboration. The paper will close with a look ahead at the structure of the collaborative relationship as we see it at this time.

The project is one of 29 teacher education development/ demonstration projects funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Focuses of the projects are varied, including such approaches to the improvement of teacher education as clinical supervision, mentor teachers, applications of

technology, and alternative certification. The focus of our project is on building a collaborative relationship in which the school district and the university can work together to develop and demonstrate research-based instructional strategies and provide appropriate experiences for pre-service student observers and student teachers. The subject matter discipline in which we are working is Social Studies, grades five through twelve.

It is our contention that the kind of teaching which brings children into active engagement with subject matter cannot be developed through college training alone. The socialization which occurs in the practice teaching experience is a more powerful influence on the pre-service teacher than any methods class (Kilgore, 1979). We are attempting to encourage teachers to move away from an emphasis on "covering" content and toward an emphasis on using content as a springboard to explore the deeper structures which underlie content (McDaniel & Lohman, 1986). Thus pre-service university students must be provided opportunities to see this kind of teaching modeled in the field by professional teachers who can provide the coaching and feedback necessary to develop the requisite teaching skills.

Since not every teacher in the public schools is an appropriate model for such teaching, a major feature of our project in the first two years has been staff development. Candidly, no amount of staff development will prepare all teachers equally to be "teacher trainers" of pre-service university students, nor is it desirable that all teachers take on such a role. It is essential, however, that no teacher be

excused from teaching at the very highest levels of effectiveness and craft. Thinking skills are not for "bright" students only; teaching which consistently makes students into passive recipients of lower level content knowledge is simply not acceptable. Changing what teachers do in the classroom is of course extremely difficult, especially when the innovation comes from without. Consequently another major thrust of our project has been an attempt to address the problems of getting teachers to take ownership of an idea that in the beginning at least was not theirs.

Such far-reaching changes as we are working toward cannot be accomplished in the school district nor in the university by administrative fiat alone (although the cause is hopeless without active support and action from administrators). We have been struck by the wideness of the gulf separating the two cultures of the school district and the university, as we have worked toward solutions to the problems which we have taken on in this project: enabling people with very different orientations to work together productively and in concert; assisting teachers in acquiring new skills and understandings of the craft of teaching; exploring the role of administrators in supporting and facilitating wholesome change in schools; and delineating the possibilities that may exist for the people in schools and the people in colleges to work as colleagues for the development of the field of education.

Initiation

Clearly the period of initiation is a very important time in a project, as the way the project is introduced can have a

powerful effect on the likelihood of successful implementation. The focus of the first year was on securing baseline data on the instructional strategies presently at use in the district. A core of university faculty observed numerous classes. Several "normal" (not project-related) lessons were videotaped. Teachers were asked to teach an inquiry lesson in the spring of the first year, which all complied with, although many commented about the timing of asking for a special lesson late in the spring.

Several issues have emerged relative to initiation. First, this particular district became involved in this project through happenstance. The superintendent and the professor who was to become project director were in conversation at a function not related to this project, when the professor described the grant proposal he was writing and wondered aloud where he would find a school district that would wish to participate. This particular superintendent has a history of searching for projects for his district. He had a staff evaluation project already underway in conjunction with another university, and was involved in a program which placed artists in schools. The question of entrepreneurial leadership thus presents itself as a factor in project initiation. On the one hand, the superintendent committed his district to the project without any real way to know whether his personnel wanted to be committed to a three year project looking at teaching strategies and the redesign of pre-service experiences for university students. Consequently, commitment on the part of system participants was something that had to be won after the fact. The other side of the question is

that without such environmental scanning the system tends to become closed and entropy increases. Accepting energies from the environment is risk-taking behavior, as events once set in motion may take on a life of their own; but without such risk-taking behavior, stagnation is a clear danger.

Another issue in initiation is the question of how collaboration can be equal. In the beginning, one partner almost by necessity holds more of the cards than the other, or at least sees the big picture more completely. The impetus for the project, the conceptual framework, and consequently the guidance of activities in the first two years has come from the university. For example, teachers and administrators in Twin Lakes were told from the beginning that a larger aspect of this project would be the placement of student teachers in the district, and that these student teachers would be expected to have experiences in the sort of teaching which the project was attempting to promote. However, the staff development aspect of the project meant that for the entire first year and most of the second, the emphasis was on teacher behaviors and instructional strategies, not on pre-service experiences. This was to some degree inevitable, as we had to prepare the site; but in practice it meant that our communication and contact with teachers and administrators was focused on getting teachers to teach according to the model. Consequently the attention of teachers was focused inwardly, concerned with what Purdue was "doing to them," rather than on how this all fit together as part of the big picture. The primary concern of teachers was on "what's wrong with the way

I teach now," and they found it easier and safer to direct resentment toward the university staff than toward their own administrators. The challenge for the third year is for school district personnel to take the reins of this project, and for university personnel to let them go.

Analysis

The course of events in the project is guided by ongoing analysis of what it means to teach according to the instructional model, and of the factors which advance or impede the formation of the collaborative relationship. The demonstration lessons are the vehicle for exploring instructional strategy. The components of the lesson planning process are: (a) forming the teachers into small planning groups related to courses taught; (b) use of planning sheets based on the critical thinking skills model; (c) the provision of released time, which not only facilitates planning but conveys the superintendent's commitment to the importance of planning; (d) a feedback process in which planned lessons are reviewed by principals and project staff, thereby involving the formal authority structure of the school in planning; (e) revision of lessons; (f) teaching the lesson with observation; and (g) debriefing each lesson.

Involved in this process are Purdue staff, the on-site coordinator, the teachers, and the building principals. The lesson itself is taught with observers, at least one of which will be some combination of the on-site coordinator, Purdue faculty, or Purdue graduate students. Purdue student observers and student teachers also frequently observe demonstration

lessons, particularly those taught by teachers to whom they have been assigned. In some instances, videotaping has been used. Feedback is written and oral, and involves a written statement in which the lesson is analyzed in reference to the instructional model which we are using in this project. The Purdue student observers and student teachers also analyze the lesson according to the dimensions of the instructional model.

Teachers have developed an impressive list of problems as they have tried to implement the model. At first teachers viewed the confrontations which are to spur student questioning as dramatic extravaganzas. We had actors portraying famous people, a class dressing as Indians and building an Indian village, and a simulation in which a class was displaced--desks, books, coat rack and all--to the gymnasium to experience the feelings of the Indians who were moved from the Southeast to the Southwest along the Trail of Tears. This view of what confrontations were quickly exhausted both the dramatic powers and patience of teachers. The lessons were seen as time out of content, instead of wedges into content, so that teachers felt under great pressure to "make up" the material they were "behind" on as a consequence of the demonstration lesson. Teachers have identified a tendency for an inquiry lesson to revert to a discovery lesson, and the attendant problem of the willingness of teachers to let go of control. Teachers have also wrestled with the problems of how to assign grades to non-traditional student products.

Other problems identified by teachers dealt with class management. How does a teacher coordinate research which may head off in all directions at once? If students are to pursue their individual questions, then sufficient and appropriate resources are essential. How can these be collected and disseminated without killing teachers and librarians? How do teachers deal with the variable responses of children, which may differ from class to class, period to period, and day to day? These concerns provide a focus for the explorations into teaching that Twin Lakes teachers will conduct in the third year.

We are also looking at the process of forming the collaborative relationship. We have an interest in training administrators in the planned change process, for which we need to enlarge our knowledge of what happens when an innovation enters a school system, and of what administrative behaviors can be shown to be of use in bringing about organizational change. Following the general procedure suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984), we have constructed a conceptual framework of the change process in schools, which allows us to construct research questions and propositions and to establish sampling parameters for the collection of data. We have adopted as one facet of our conceptual framework the Leadership Obstacle Course (LOC) model of Herriott and Gross (1979). The LOC model proposes that the degree to which an innovation is implemented depends on the presence of five conditions during the periods of attempted implementation: (a) the degree to which organizational members obtain a clear understanding of the innovation; (b) the extent to

which participants possess the required skills and capabilities demanded by the innovation; (c) the extent to which materials and equipment are available when needed; (d) the extent to which organizational arrangements are made compatible with the innovation; and (e) the extent to which participants are motivated to expend the necessary time and effort. They further hypothesize that the extent to which these five conditions are present during implementation is a function of the performance of management.

We have selected additional variables to serve as data collection focuses. They are: the quality of the information provided to participants; the suitability of the project for the organizational context; the actions and behaviors of school district administrators and university project staff; the extent of participant involvement in planning; the sources of resistance to the projects by participants; and participant perceptions of project impact on their roles, skills, competencies, and practices. The intersection of the dimensions of the LOC model and the data collection focuses forms the research propositions which we are currently exploring in data collection and analysis.

Data collection to date has taken the form of structured interviews with participating teachers and administrators, classroom observations, informal conversations, attendance at project-related meetings, and collection of project documents. Data analysis to date has involved coding transcribed notes with a set of codes based on the propositions generated from our conceptual framework, and the generation of a first cut at

establishing directions and strength of relationships between the dimensions of the matrix, which is shown graphically in Figure 1.

We have made several changes in the conduct of the project based on analysis of data collected to date. From interviews and observations it has become apparent that teachers were far from comfortable with the dimensions of the thinking skills model and its implications for classroom practice. There was also a sense on the part of project teacher participants that they didn't know who to go to for information and assistance.

Accordingly, we perceived that we needed to shore up communication and coordination. We have responded by hiring an on-site coordinator, a former teacher in the school district who lives in the community, who can work closely with the teacher planning groups as they develop demonstration lessons. This includes guiding teachers in their initial plans, working with principals and the Purdue staff in monitoring planning sheets, and providing feedback to the teachers following the monitoring of written plans. The duties of the coordinator also include participation in bi-weekly meetings of the central planning staff, maintaining liaison between Purdue and Twin Lakes School Corporation, and assistance in collecting data and documenting the course of the project.

Similarly, we believe that the actions of administrators are powerful determiners of the extent to which organizational arrangements are made compatible with the project, and of the extent to which participants are motivated to expend time and effort. Consequently, we are increasing the involvement of

principals in lesson planning and feedback, and in the experiences which Purdue student teachers and observers will receive in the district.

Findings: Warnings

Efforts to achieve collaboration with universities are not without risk for school districts. The cultures of the two organizations are quite different, and the difference in orientations can bring about pressures and strains that the administrative staff in particular may find unnecessarily burdensome. One problem we encountered was a suspicion on the part of teachers that university staff were not sincere in their professed willingness to work with public school teachers, but were simply involved in career enhancement. There were frequent references to "getting your article out of this." Publishing and presenting at professional meetings are activities that are foreign to the values of most teachers. Further, teachers really don't like the idea of experimentation. We found the term <u>experiment</u> to have pejorative connotations. It left the impression we were doing something the value of which had not been established. Teachers felt that to an extent they too were guinea pigs, and were afraid that they were going to be held up as examples of how not to teach. This surfaced particularly with respect to videotaping: several teachers voiced concern that if they were videotaped, eventually the tapes would end up being shown in some university classroom as an example of bad teaching.

Other problems that surfaced involved issues of time and communication, and university insensitivity to the way schools

work, particularly the demands of the schedule and the flow of children who must constantly be looked after. An example of this is highlighted by an episode in the first year when we showed up unannounced to videotape teachers. The high school principal, who knew how strongly the superintendent supported the project, wanted to make his teachers available. The teachers were furious, however, that they were being taped without advance warning. Through a combination of the authority of his office, his persuasive skills, and the credibility that that principal has established with his faculty, the taping occurred, but it generated distrust and suspicion that "they were doing it to us again." Similarly, there was another instance when Purdue student observers were placed at the middle school without the superintendent having been informed that they were coming. This was simply an oversight on the part of the Purdue professor responsible, but it violated the first rule of school administration--never surprise the superintendent--and created a minor crisis that while solvable, nevertheless used up energy and credibility that had then to be replenished.

Teachers who had been through our "shop" and found themselves back working with their old professors had trouble relating to them after the passage of time. There was a sense of here I am back in class again, listening to the old spiel. Another problem is the press of time. When teachers talk about the work load being crushing, of course it is. Teachers are genuinely jealous of their time with the children, and resent any interruptions, be they minor with the intercom, or major with

released time, feeling that the children get less than the optimum when the teacher is not with them. This is of course a structural problem that we have to address: how to make time and resources available for genuine planning.

We have learned that teachers often personalize the feedback. We think we're talking substantively about the lessons, but they hear a criticism of themselves as professionals. Some teachers, although thankfully not many, are locked into a dance of desperation with the children they are supposed to teach. A project teacher said the first spring: "Higher order thinking skills for these kids is like giving perfume to someone who needs a bath. The problem is to get these kids to do any work. I'll agree that education is the pits, but you guys are missing the boat by a hundred miles." At a later time that same teacher, talking with project personnel about the instructional strategy we are using in the project, blurted out in considerable distress, "I can't open up the classroom like you're talking about. I'm afraid some kid will ask me a question I can't answer."

Teachers do not easily re-orient classroom routines to the demands of a new instructional model. This takes time, and is a stressful process. We have discovered that there are several strategies that teachers use to avoid confronting the problems of implementing an instructional strategy. One is denial. A high school social studies teacher: "You can't role play with high school kids. It would turn into a circus level. Advanced students you can do this with. Remedial you have to spoonfeed.

They won't be willing to dig into packets." Another strategy, illustrated by this comment, is getting distracted by side issues. Role playing is a useful strategy in initiating lessons, but by no means indispensable. The problem of packets of materials has loomed very large for the high school staff, but this is a factor of their emphasis on controlling every aspect of what goes on in class. They have tended to conceptualize a content-oriented lesson as one in which the teacher presents a packet of content knowledge to the student, who goes through a series of directions that the teacher has spelled out. Unfortunately, they also conceptualize an inquiry lesson as one in which the teacher presents a packet of questions to the student, which the student will answer by following a set of instructions from the teacher.

Teachers also subject each other to a great deal of peer pressure not to change teaching strategies. One teacher made another teacher feel "like a fool" because the second teacher had been meeting with a third teacher to plan project lessons on their shared conference period. The point was he was giving his time to the project, and wasn't being reimbursed for it. Another problem is turf building. One teacher wouldn't come to an after school feedback session because two of the high school teachers, who coach, had been excused from the meeting. He also expressed the view that elementary teachers had nothing of value to say to him.

Finally, we have had to confront teachers' fears about the loss of control, as illustrated by the teacher who feared

students would ask questions to which he wouldn't know the answer. Another teacher: "If you're going to do it you've got to be sincere in letting things run their course, wherever that may lead. And it may end up ugly. The veneer of civilization is mighty thin, and you scratch, you get down deep, you may let loose a monster."

The perception that in order to develop thinking skills one has to sacrifice content has been a powerful concern for every teacher in the project. The middle school principal noted that the idea that certain content must be covered in social studies seemed to him to be a phantom concept: the pressure to cover content is apparently self-imposed, as it doesn't come from administrators or state guidelines. The high school principal suggested that the pressure was in a way a crutch; if you think you've got to cover so much content, then you don't have to worry about new ideas or concepts or anything that is nebulous and hard to grasp. You just keep chugging through the text. We also suspect that students, particularly at the higher grades, are a source of the pressure to keep things as usual. One girl noted on a student response sheet: "I'm tired of doing things for Purdue and not my grade." We are cognizant that she may have been picking up signals from the teachers about "project lessons," but we suspect she also didn't like having gone to school for 11 years, in which she has become very adept at the school game, and then having the rules changed on her.

Findings: What Seems to Work

Involvement in collaborative projects is not all negative, of course. Teachers have cited released time for planning, involvement on committees, and the opportunity to present at the Indiana Social Studies Conference as signs that they are respected and therefore boosts to their sense of professional worth. Indeed, public relations is a motivator. Both teachers and administrators mentioned involvement with the university as a "feather in the cap" and a sign that things were really on the move in the school district. This is more than ego, of course. If a teacher feels more like a professional, that teacher is likely to be more effective, certainly more enthusiastic. The middle school principal suggested in the first year of the project that teachers could conceivably be invited to present in a university class as a consequence of being involved in the project, and that such a presentation would enhance teachers' self-image. This is a direction that looks promising for the third year, and this administrator was on to it from the beginning.

Teachers' feelings that a proposed innovation can help solve problems important to them and their students has been suggested as a powerful motivator to encourage teachers to attempt to implement that innovation (Chesler, Schmuck, & Lippitt, 1975). Our project attempts to document that usefulness through a focus on concrete assessment of outcomes, suggested by Lippitt, Edmundson, Cowling, and Lippitt (1975) as a trigger to motivate change effort in education. Our evaluation plans include

obtaining base-line data on classroom behavior using a high inference teacher observation scale specifically designed to reflect the teaching behaviors specified by the instructional model guiding our work. In addition, another group of project workers is at work developing instruments to measure problem-solving behavior and intellectual growth.

There have been a number of project activities that teachers liked. We established a timetable of demonstration lessons and other events for the 2nd year, and provided a thorough explanation of the expected stages of the model, complete with planning sheets for lessons. These actions helped allay fears based on the unknown. We took librarians and library aides to the Purdue library, and gave them library cards and a red carpet tour of the facility by the education librarian, and involved them in the summer workshop that preceded the second year. This made them feel a part of the project team as well as showing them that we appreciated their contribution. Further, involving librarians in inservice allowed the early establishment of partnerships between teachers and their main source for resources. Involving principals in the processes of planning and critiquing the thinking skills lessons encouraged the interchange of thoughts, ideas, concepts and methods, leading to a more collegial relationship between teachers and administrators, and a sense of more open communication. As a consequence of all of this, as teachers sensed the university people were better organized, they felt more secure.

Our idea of collaboration is that if it won't work everywhere, it won't work anywhere. Twin Lakes is distinctive because it is so normal. We are not working in a hothouse environment. Structures and roles that will work between Purdue and Twin Lakes will work between any other university and any other school district. Similarly, things that are problems in this setting are likely to be problems elsewhere. The question of videotaping lessons is a good example. Educators have been using videotape in instructional development since videotape was first invented. But here's a normal school district which has never used it, with people who are powerfully put off by the thought that a lesson might be captured for analysis.

The issue of the videotaping was somewhat defused by getting a volunteer (a sixth grade teacher) to make a videotape of his 3rd demonstration lesson. The university audio visual department went up and did a professional job, with voice overs explaining the different parts of the lesson and what the teacher was trying to accomplish. We showed the videotape at the February all-day inservice, and asked the teachers to critique it. They were as impressed by the teacher's bravery in allowing a lesson to be videotaped as by any particular feature of the lesson.

We are learning that changes in the school district are easier to effect than changes in the university. We still don't have Purdue lined up, or all of the major players assigned. Student teaching, as well as the methods courses leading to that experience, are largely taught and supervised by graduate students because faculty are not rewarded for field experiences.

Horror stories abound: a girl's mother assigned as her supervising teacher; a graduate student who went through student teaching in math in the fall, and then was assigned to supervise math student teachers in the spring; a graduate student who had never taught and wasn't even certified assigned to supervise elementary student teachers.

Findings: What Administrators Do

One lesson learned has been the extent to which the principals must be the engines that drive the project. Our blueprint was to make them instructional leaders who would work with teachers in planning and reviewing the lessons. By the third demonstration lesson they had become involved in the many demands on their time and energies, and we found it easier to work directly with the teachers ourselves. Consequently we missed opportunities to bring the principals up to speed on the instructional model, and to ally the authority of their offices in support of the kind of teaching which the project is designed to bring about. We have talked with the superintendent and the principals about this, and they are firmly back in the process of planning and carrying out the fourth demonstration lesson.

Administrators in collaborative relationships with universities must be aware that the pressures and strains of change will cause tensions and stresses in the school that weren't there before the innovation began. These stresses and strains are not necessarily fatal, but they must be dealt with. Hurt feelings are not trivial, and can spread to a general discontent.

It is the suggestion of the principals, which we are following, that the sorts of teaching behaviors which we are attempting to achieve in the project be incorporated into the evaluation model (essentially a clinical evaluation model) already in operation in the school district. Their position is that if we are committed to teaching which enhances thinking skills as part of the project, then we should be committed to it as part of teacher evaluation; otherwise we don't believe in it as appropriate for normal classroom routine. Our initial impulse was to reject this idea, since we didn't want to place additional pressure on teachers who were struggling with an unfamiliar model by linking it to evaluation. The more we thought about the principals' position, the more sense it made, and next year they will require this type of teaching in the lessons they critique for teacher evaluation.

The Twin Lakes School Corporation has become involved in additional improvement projects which are providing a synergistic effect to the Enhancing Thinking Skills Project. One concurrent project is the Arts-In-Education Program, through which the district was able during the first semester to secure the services of a creative dramatics specialist. The artist worked with the social studies teachers, and components of creative dramatics were incorporated into several of the demonstration lessons. The faculty, dubious at first, were completely won over by the powerful experiences she created with the children. One of the middle school teachers, who had never done anything like this before in nearly 20 years of teaching, portrayed Sgt. York

before his class to introduce the demonstration lesson. The power of creative dramatics to make history come alive helped teachers arrange confrontations which led more successfully to personalized planning.

The other program is the Teacher Quality Program. Funded by a grant from the State of Indiana, this program allows teachers in a variety of subject areas to develop resource units which will move beyond the knowledge level of learning offered by textbooks and lectures, and which will work toward a variety of teaching styles which incorporate problem solving, inquiry, application, and synthesis. The Teacher Quality Program is coordinated by one of the elementary principals. Teachers in the Twin Lakes School Corporation who wish to participate offer a proposal to a coordinating committee. If successful, they are funded for time and materials to produce their lesson units. An additional responsibility of a funded teacher is to present the materials developed to other teachers within the district and surrounding districts. Several of the Teacher Quality teachers are also project participants. Most, however, teach in subject areas other than social studies. Through this vehicle, the teaching behaviors which this project is attempting to promote are being spread throughout the entire school system.

Huberman and Miles (1984) found the involvement of the superintendent to be crucial in building district-level dynamism for school improvement. Not only does the involvement of the superintendent give organizational legitimacy to the innovation, but establishes expectations for behavior on the part of every

participant at every level in the district. It is the superintendent who best can serve as a linker and coordinator both within the system with building principals and teachers, and with outside agencies and consultants (Katz & Kahn, 1975; Lippitt, et al., 1975).

The superintendent in Twin Lakes has been very active. It was his sense of educational entrepreneurship that committed his district to the project in the first place. An example will illustrate his style of leadership. In February of this year we held a day-long inservice for all project teachers. At the end of this day the superintendent handed around a sheet of paper with these questions: "Has growth occurred? Have you developed a sense of personal and professional growth? Do you feel better about your teaching? Do you consider more deeply the instruction strategies you will employ for certain lessons and units? Do you feel better about student learning and retention of subject matter? Would you have done the things you are doing in the Enhancing Thinking Skills project on your own?" He then challenged his teachers and principals with this thought: "If you can answer 'No' to one of these, you need to look within your heart and ask yourself, 'Why?'"

The superintendent then presented a pin and a certificate to the teacher who had volunteered to make the videotape of his demonstration lesson. The superintendent had seen the videotape earlier in the day, and impressed with the teacher's professionalism in allowing his peers to view and critique his lesson, had gone back to his office at lunch and drawn up the

certificate, which he then took to a frame shop and had framed. The certificate and pin were a powerful reinforcer of the support of administration, and a boost for the teacher. This superintendent knows that symbolic actions have a lot of power.

Findings: Issues

It would of course be simpler to conduct either a staff development project or to experiment with collaborative relationships for the renewal of pre-service experiences without combining the two. We believe, however, that if we are to make a significant impact on teacher preparation, part of that impact involves finding ways to avoid socializing young teachers into business as usual. There are reasons for business as usual, and they include the monolithic press of professional practice as realized in schools; the lack of esteem and rewards for clinical work by professors; and the lack of bridges and contact between universities and the teachers which they have trained (As one teacher said, "Why do I only get requests for money from the Alumni Association? Why don't I ever get a note that says, 'We're doing something interesting in American History. Come on down here this Saturday and have a look'?"). The fact that we may have two projects going on here is problematic; but so is socializing teachers into business as usual.

Therefore staff development is an integral aspect of establishing the collaborative relationship. A district teacher commented: "I learned most of the tricks of my trade from a master teacher who's now retired, and (a Purdue professor) would be offended, but I took the methods class after I student taught

so I could see through a lot of the flim flam, because I've been in the real world. And I think it gave me quite an advantage over a lot of the kids who come out that have been student teachers, because they walk in with expectations which can't really be achieved." Teachers and university faculty are very close as the teacher begins his career, but as time goes by contacts are lost, and the school district culture becomes very insular. It's equally true that the university faculty can become estranged from day to day public school realities. Interestingly, there have been frequent observations by teachers that now that they've been out in the field for awhile, they feel they have something to say to the professor, more as an equal, no longer the student sitting at the feet of the master, but colleagues, each worthy of respect.

The Features of the Relationship

As we face the third year of this project three basic focuses seem apparent. First, we will continue to explore what it means to teach according to our instructional model. Second, we will proceed with putting in place a more carefully delineated pre-service experience for Purdue students, so that they may learn through practice what it means to teach in ways that enhance critical thinking skills. Third, we will attempt to institutionalize a collaborative relationship between the school district and the university through the creation of new roles. We believe that we can only achieve any of these objectives as we are able to put structures in place--contracts drive the world.

We are looking at this time at three kinds of teachers. One set of teachers, the smallest, will be teacher preparation specialists. We see their role involving working with student teachers in a carefully designed set of activities designed to lead them into the type of teaching promoted by our model. These activities are being worked out now through conversations between teachers, administrators, and Purdue faculty. Say and Clift (1987) have noted that school district and university staff rarely if ever confer to construct jointly a field experience that meets the goals of all concerned. In this project, the main impetus for the revision of the pre-service experience has come from the superintendent. In this project the experiences will be designed collaboratively. Suggestions to date include student observation of lessons based on the components of the model, taught by Twin Lakes teachers; joint planning and analysis of lesson plans; debriefing of lessons taught, including analysis of videotaped lessons, and some teaching duties in Purdue methods classes, in a format yet to be determined.

The next group of teachers, somewhat larger, will work with Purdue student observers and teach demonstration lessons, although they will not actually take on responsibility for a student teacher. They will build lesson plans based on the components of the instructional model, and perhaps will be involved in building videotaped modules demonstrating various aspects of the model. The rest of the teachers will have limited exposure to Purdue student observers and student teachers. They will however continue to work on lessons based on the components

of the model, following the planning sequence used in the demonstration lessons this year. Although the levels of participation of Twin Lakes teachers will be differentiated in the third year, no teacher will be allowed to opt entirely out of the project. To allow a teacher to be excused from learning to teach in a way that enhances thinking skills is to state implicitly that some teachers are allowed to teach with inferior technique, a second-class citizenship that simply is not permissible.

We are looking now at the resources we can provide to make these new teaching roles possible. We are exploring the relationship and reimbursement we can provide from Purdue, something along an adjunct professor or visiting instructor line. The Twin Lakes superintendent is exploring the resources of money, reduced teaching loads, and time for planning which he can make available for these positions. We hope in the third year not only to design models of the teaching role, but also to be able to cost them out, which will be valuable information for policy makers at the state level.

An idea that we are finding increasingly appealing is the need for a person to act as a broker between the university and the school district for the kind of communication and decisions that are needed to make these relationships work. The broker has dimensions of a project manager, but is also a person who trades in ideas and cooperation--the person with a foot in each world. This person is not necessarily and probably not advisedly the teacher preparation specialist. It should be someone with a

quasi-administrative orientation, but aware of the exigencies of teaching and the process of research. We are considering incorporating these concepts into the job description of our on-site coordinator. This person, funded by Purdue but based in Monticello, has been able to serve as a communication channel for cares and concerns and substantive matters related to the instructional model. She has assisted teachers in planning, observed lessons, provided feedback, worked out snags and snafus, delivered materials and resources, and interpreted from one culture to the other. We are exploring the possibility of establishing Monticello as a centralized site for practice teachers in a variety of grade levels and subject fields, and assigning the on-site coordinator as director of that center. We are attempting to determine the teaching role she could have at Purdue, and as in the case of the teacher preparation specialists, we are looking at the official status she could have with each institution, and what contribution each would make to her support.

References

Chesler, M., Schmuck, R. A., & Lippitt, R. (1975). The principal's role in facilitating innovation. In Baldridge and Deal (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations, (pp. 321-327). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Herriott, R. E., & Gross, N. (1979). The dynamics of planned educational change: Case studies and analyses. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York: Plenum Press.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1975). Organizational change. In Baldridge and Deal (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations, (pp. 35-74). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Kilgore, A. M. (1979). Pilot project shows definite link between pre-, in-service education. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(4), 10-12.

Lippitt, L., Edmundson, W. D., Couing, K., & Lippitt, R. (1975). Quest for quality education. Ann Arbor, MI: Human Resource Development Associates of Ann Arbor.

McDaniel, E. D. & Lohman, J. (1986). An instructional model for cognitive growth. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Say, M., & Clift, R. T. (1987). If pre-service teacher education is the question, is collaboration the answer? Unpublished revision of a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, 1986.

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Leadership Obstacle Course dimensions and data collection focuses.

LEADERSHIP OBSTACLE COURSE DIMENSIONS (Herriott and Gross, 1979)

Data Collection Focuses	Degree to which participants get clear understanding of the project	Extent to which participants possess required skills and capabilities	Extent to which materials and equipment are available when needed	Extent to which organizational arrangements are made compatible with the project	Extent to which participants are motivated to expend time and effort
Quality of the information provided to participants	--> II				--> I
Suitability of the project for the organizational context		I <--		I <--	
Actions and behaviors of school district administrators	--> II	--> I	--> I	--> II	--> II
Actions and behaviors of university project personnel	--> II	--> II	--> II	--> I	--> I
Extent of involvement by participants in planning	--> I	--> II	--> I	--> I	--> I
Sources of resistance to the project by participants	I <--	I <--	I <--	II <--	I <--
Participant perceptions of project impact on their roles, skills, competencies, and practices.	I <--	II <--	--> I <--	I <--	--> II <--

Arrows indicate "is a function of."
I indicates an impact or influence.
II indicates a greater impact or influence.